

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-21 in the application. Presently, the Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8-9, 11, 13, 15-18 and 20. No claims have been canceled or added. Accordingly, Claims 1-21 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 19-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,668,852 to Holmes ("Holmes") in view of: U.S. Patent No. 5,561,703 to Arledge ("Arledge"). Newly amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 currently include the element of automatically transmitting at least a portion of party identification information to a pager associated with a paged party based on a capability of the pager. The combination of Holmes and Arledge fails to teach or suggest this newly claimed element.

Holmes is directed to providing information associated with a telephone caller to a paging system when the caller directs a call to a pager. (*See* column 1, lines 11-15.) The paging system can then forward the caller-associated information (CAI) to the pager. (*See* column 2, lines 60-64.) The Applicant does not find, however, where Holmes teaches or suggests forwarding the CAI based on a capability of the pager. On the contrary, Holmes does not appear to address the capability of the pager but is concerned with automatically extracting information from an incoming call so that it may be forwarded to the pager. (*See* column 2, lines 50-57.) Therefore, Holmes fails to teach or suggest automatically transmitting information to a pager based on a capability of the pager as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15.

Arledge does not cure the deficiency of Holmes. Specifically, Arledge does not teach or suggest automatically transmitting information to a pager based on a capability of the pager. Arledge does teach a user may customize the format of received paging information, (*i.e.*, column 6, lines 55-65), but this differs from transmitting information based on pager capability. As in Holmes, the Applicant does not find where Arledge even addresses considering the capability of the pager when transmitting information.

Thus, Holmes and Arledge, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 and, therefore, fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness with respect to Claims 1, 8 and 15 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-17 and 19-21 are not obvious, and thus the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection and issue allowance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 4-7, 11-14 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 4-7, 11-14 and 18-21 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Holmes and Arledge in view of: U.S. Patent No. 5,592,531 to Chen, U.S. Patent No. 5,940,740 to Aas or U.S. Patent No. 6,044,247 to Taskett for Claims 4, 11 and 18; Taskett or U.S. Patent No. 6,278,862 to Henderson for Claims 5, 12 and 19; Taskett or U.S. Patent No. 6,192,218 to Laufmann for Claims 6, 13 and 20; and U.S. Patent No. 5,742,668 to Pepe for Claims 7, 14 and 21.

As discussed above, the combination of Holmes and Arledge does not teach or suggest the claimed element of automatically transmitting at least a portion of the party identification information to a pager associated with a paged party based on a capability of the pager as recited in

Claims 1, 8 and 15. Cheng, Aas, Taskett, Henderson, Laufmann and Pepe have not been cited to cure the deficiencies of the Holmes and Arledge combination but to teach the subject matter of dependent claims. Regarding Cheng, Aas and Taskett, each one has been cited to teach voice recognition of input from a paging party as an alternative to input by DTMF. More specifically, Cheng is directed to a selective call communication system that uses voice data entry, Aas is directed to a messaging system that allows verification whether a message has been sent, and Taskett is directed to a wireless paging system that facilitates connection by a subscriber to a call controller using a prepaid telephone card. However, while Cheng, Aas and Taskett may teach or suggest voice recognition of input from a paging party as the Examiner asserts, this does not teach the claimed elements of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15.

Regarding Henderson, Henderson has been cited to teach caller information with location and is directed to an improved communication system that more efficiently and accurately handles interactions with page-originating communicants. (*See* column 1, lines 59-64.) Laufmann has been cited to teach caller information stored in a database (*see* Examiner's Action, page 6) and is directed to transmitting and identifying predetermined calling party information as part of a messaging signal. (*See* Abstract.) Again, these do not teach or suggest automatically transmitting at least a portion of party identification information to a pager associated with a paged party based on a capability of the pager.

Pepe has been cited to disclose various mobile communication subscribers (*see* Examiner's Action, pages 6-7) and is directed to a personal communications internetwork that provides a subscriber with the ability to remotely control the receipt and delivery of wireless and wireline electronic text messages. (*See* Abstract.) Pepe teaches that the subscribers message receipt and

delivery options are maintained in a database that the subscriber may update. (See Abstract.) These features do not teach or suggest, however, automatically transmitting at least a portion of party identification information to a pager associated with a paged party based on a capability of the pager.

Thus, Holmes, Cheng, Aas, Taskett, Henderson, Laufmann or Pepe, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 and, therefore, the cited combination of references fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for Claims 1, 8 and 15 and Claims dependent thereon. Accordingly, Claims 4-7, 11-14 and 18-21 are not obvious, and thus the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection and issue allowance thereof.


III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1-21.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned attorney of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, P.C.


J. Joel Justiss
Registration No. 48,981

Dated: 10/13/04
P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800